arXiv:1609.06359v1 [physics.soc-ph] 18 Sep 2016

Game Over Interdependent Networks: Rationality Makes the System Inherent Deficient

Yuhang Fan,[1,2] Gongze Cao,[2] Shibo He,[1] Jiming Chen,[1] and Youxian Sun[1]

[1]*State Key Lab. of Industrial Control Technology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China*
[2]*School of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China*

Many real-world systems are composed of interdependent networks that rely on one another. Such networks are typically designed and operated by different entities, who aim at maximizing their own interest. In this paper, we study the game over interdependent networks, investigating how the rational behaviors of entities impact the whole system. We first introduce a mathematical model to quantify the interacting payoffs among varying entities. Then we study the Nash equilibrium and compare it with the optimal social welfare. We reveal that the cooperation between different entities can be reached to maximize the social welfare only when the average degree of each network is constant. Otherwise, there may be a huge gap between the Nash equilibrium and optimal social welfare. Therefore, the rationality of different entities that operates these networks makes the system inherently deficient and even extremely vulnerable in some cases. Furthermore, we uncover some factors (such as weakening coupled strength of interdependent networks, designing suitable topology dependency of the system) that help reduce the gap and improve the system vulnerability.

In interdependent networks, nodes from one network rely on nodes from other networks. The failure of a node in one network causes its dependent node in other network to also fail, leading to an iterative cascade of failure. They are, consequently, much more fragile than independent networks [1][2]. Much attention has been paid on how the interdependency of the networks results in the catastrophic cascade of failure and how to improve the robustness [3][4][5][6] and repair the interdependent networks [7].

In practice, different networks are typically designed and operated by varying entities [8][9][10]. For example, the power network and communication network are owned and operated by different companies in China. Each entity aims at maximizing its own interest when building the network, without considering the overall network performance. Clearly, there is a game during the formation of the interdependent networks, where a network is taken as a player. Studying such a game helps understand how the topology of the practical interdependent networks is formed, and provide insight into their inherent performance degradation, which has not been studied yet.

We introduce a mathematical framework based on random graph theory and percolation theory [11] for studying this game. The system is composed of n interdependent networks $\{N_1, N_2, \cdots, N_n\}$ and the dependency is fixed. After a fraction $1-p_i$ of nodes randomly being removed from network N_i, $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, there is an iterative cascade of failure. We denote that the fraction of nodes in giant component in network N_i by $P_{\infty,i}$ (when the number of nodes approaches infinity, it represents the probability of the existence of the giant component) which is a function of $p_1,\ldots,p_n$. Let $\langle k\rangle_i$ be the average degree of network N_i. The payoff of a network N_i is the difference of the income I_i and cost O_i associated with operating and building the network. Clearly, the income is positively correlated to the fraction of nodes in mutually connected giant component $P_{\infty,i}$ [1] (i.e., the ratio of functional nodes), and is denoted by $I_i(P_{\infty,i})$. As $P_{\infty,i}$ is a function of p_j, $j \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, we can regard I_i as a function of p_j, $j \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$. Since constructing and operating links incur expense, we can assume that the cost function O_i increases with the average degree of the network, i.e., $O_i(\langle k\rangle_i)$.

As the fraction p_i of nodes that fail in network N_i is not a constant in real world and affected by many factors (such as weather condition for power network [12]), we suppose that it follows a probability distribution ψ_i, that is, $P(p_i<\alpha) = \int_0^\alpha \psi_i(x)\mathrm{d}x$. Then we can compute the mathematical expectation $E(I_i)$ of the income I_i. The payoff Y_i of the network N_i is thus:

$$Y_i = E\left(I_i(P_{\infty,i})\right) - O_i(\langle k\rangle_i) \tag{1}$$

And the payoff Y of the whole system (a.k.a. social welfare) is

$$Y = \sum_{i=i}^{n} Y_i \tag{2}$$

Note that increasing $\langle k\rangle$ may not always improve social welfare since both the income and the cost increase with $\langle k\rangle$. In a cooperative system, an optimal $\langle k\rangle$ can be calculated to maximize the social welfare. Take for an example of two interdependent ER networks with the same average degree $\langle k\rangle$ [13], the cascade process is a first order percolation transition which is discontinuous at threshold p_c. It has been shown that the threshold $p_c = 2.4554/\langle k\rangle$[1]. We assume, for simplicity, that the income I is 0 when $p<p_c$, and $I=1$ when $p>p_c$, and that the fraction of nodes being removed p follows a uniform distribution. The cost function O is set to be a linear function with coefficient 0.08. Then, as the social welfare is $Y = (1-p_c) - 0.08\langle k\rangle = 1-(2.4554/\langle k\rangle + 0.08\langle k\rangle)$. Clearly, higher $\langle k\rangle$ leads to higher income as well as higher cost. It is easy to compute the optimal social welfare at $\langle k\rangle = 5.54$ and $Y = 0.11$ [14][15].

Unfortunately, the average degree is in generic implicit in p_c and $P_{\infty,i}$, which makes the analysis complicated. We introduce real variables $\{q_i\}, i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, as strategy profiles to quantify the construction pattern of network N_i by the entity i. We suppose that the strategy set of entity i is Q_i, i.e.,

the range of variable q_i, and $Q = Q_1 \times \ldots \times Q_n$ is the set of strategy profiles in this game. Let q_{-i} be the strategy profile of all entities except for player i. According to [16], the degree distribution of a node in network N_i can be characterized by $P_i(k,q_i)$. For instance, q_i could be average degree for an ER network decided by entity i. We introduce the generating function of network N_i whose arguments are x and q_i as

$$G_i(x,q_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_i(k,q_i)x^k. \tag{3}$$

Different from previous studies [16][17], the strategy q_i is included in the generating function to assist the analysis of the game. The average degree $\langle k\rangle_i$ of network N_i can be calculated as

$$\langle k\rangle_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}G_i(1,q_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} kP_i(k,q_i), \tag{4}$$

which is a continuous function of q_i. Analogously, we introduce the generating function of the underlying branching process

$$H_i(x,q_i) = \frac{G_i'(x,q_i)}{G_i'(1,q_i)}, \tag{5}$$

where $G_i'(x,q_i)$ is the derivative of G with respect to x. The probability that a randomly chosen surviving nodes belongs to giant component is given by

$$g_i(p,q_i) = 1 - G_i[pf_i(p,q_i) + 1 - p, q_i], \tag{6}$$

where f_i satisfies

$$f_i(p,q_i) = H_i[pf_i(p,q_i) + 1 - p, q_i] \tag{7}$$

for $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$.

Similar to [2][18], for fixed q_i, $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, we can solve the equations of unknowns x_i and y_{ij}

$$x_i = p_i \prod_{j=1}^{n} [r_{ji}y_{ji}g_j(x_j) - r_{ji} + 1] \tag{8}$$

$$y_{ij} = \frac{x_i}{r_{ji}y_{ji}g_j(x_j) - r_{ji} + 1} \tag{9}$$

where $r_{ji} \geq 0$ is the fraction of nodes in network N_i, that directly depends on nodes of network N_j and $r_{ii} = 0$. We can analytically compute that the fraction $P_{\infty,k} = x_k g_k(x_k)$ of nodes in giant component of network N_k as a function of $p_1,\ldots,p_n$ and $q_1,\ldots,q_n$. Specially, if $n = 2$, equation (9) yields $y_{12} = p_1$, $y_{21} = p_2$. Equations (8) can be simplified as:

$$x_1 = p_1(r_{21}p_2g_2(x_2) - r_{21} + 1) \tag{10}$$

$$x_2 = p_2(r_{12}p_1g_1(x_1) - r_{12} + 1). \tag{11}$$

If the process of cascade is a first order percolation transition, there is a single step discontinuity at the threshold p_c, which is also a function of q_i [4]; otherwise, we let $p_c = 0$. According to equation (1), we calculate the payoff Y_i of network N_i

$$Y_i = \int_{p_c}^{1} \ldots \int_{p_c}^{1} I_i(P_{\infty,i}(q_i,\ldots,q_n,p_1,\ldots,p_n)) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \psi_j(p_j)\mathrm{d}p_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}p_n - O_i(\langle k\rangle_i). \tag{12}$$

From (2), we can compute the social welfare $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$ of the whole system. When each entity $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ chooses strategy q_i, the payoff of entity i is denoted by $Y_i(q)$ and the payoff of the system is denoted by $Y(q)$.

Before presenting our main results, we give the following definitions. A strategy profile $q^* \in Q$ achieves optimal social welfare if

$$\forall q \in Q; \quad Y(q^*) \geq Y(q). \tag{13}$$

A strategy profile $q^* \in Q$ is a Nash equilibrium if

$$\forall i, \quad q_i \in Q_i; \quad Y_i(q_i^*, q_{-i}^*) \geq Y_i(q_i, q_{-i}). \tag{14}$$

In our model, when the average degree is fixed, that is, $O_i(\langle k\rangle_i)$ is unchanged about q_i for $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, this is a positive-sum game. In equations (8) and (9), g_i are monotonously increasing functions on $[0,1]$. We can prove that all $P_{\infty,i}$ are positively correlated in interdependent networks. Since all O_i are fixed, according to (12), Y_i, $i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, are positively correlated too. This indicates that it will not reduce other entities' payoffs when one entity changes his strategy profile to improve his own payoff. It is easy to see that Nash equilibrium reaches the optimal social welfare. Therefore, in such scenario, the individual payoff of each entity is maximized at the same point as the optimal social welfare. The cooperation between different networks can be reached.

For example, for the game over interdependent scale-free (SF) networks whose strategy space is the power of degree distribution, as [1] shows, a higher power leads to an improvement of the system's robustness. Due to the above conclusion, when the average degree is fixed, the entities of different networks can cooperate to improve the power of distribution as high as possible and reach the optimal social welfare.

However, if each O_i is not fixed, the cooperation between different networks may be unattainable. In fact, if the real variables $q_1,\ldots,q_n$ can range in some interval continuously (that is, this is a continuous game), the cooperation is not reachable. With out loss of generality, we can assume that payoff functions are differential. Then the necessary condition for a pure strategy Nash equilibrium is $\partial Y_i/\partial q_i = 0$, $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. The necessary condition for the optimal social welfare in this game is $\partial Y/\partial q_i = 0$, $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$.

We proceed to analyze the game when the average degree can be adjusted by q_i of each network N_i. When the payoff of this system achieves its Nash equilibrium $Y_i = Y_i^{\max}$, we have $\partial Y_i/\partial q_i = 0$ for $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. According to equation (1), we have

$$\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial q_i} = \frac{\partial E(I_i(P_{\infty,i}))}{\partial q_i} - \frac{\partial O_i(\langle k\rangle_i)}{\partial q_i} = 0. \tag{15}$$

Note that for a $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, $\langle k\rangle_i$ does not rely on q_j if $j \neq i$, leading to $\partial O_i/\partial q_j = 0$. At the Nash equilibrium, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial Y}{\partial q_j} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial E(I_i(P_{\infty,i}))}{\partial q_j} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial O_i(\langle k\rangle_i)}{\partial q_j} \\ &= \sum_{i\neq j} \frac{\partial E(I_i(P_{\infty,i})))}{\partial q_j}\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Since $\langle k\rangle_i$ is not fixed about q_i, $\partial E(I_i(P_{\infty,i}))/\partial q_i = \partial O_i(\langle k\rangle_i)/\partial q_i \neq 0$. Due to the interdependency, the incomes of n networks, which are decided by the robustness of the system, are positively correlated. $\partial E(I_i(P_{\infty,i})))/\partial q_j$ have the same sign and do not equal to 0, leading to $\partial Y/\partial q_j \neq 0$. Therefore, Nash equilibrium (since the concrete payoff function is given here, the pure strategy Nash equilibrium may not exist. However, our model can be easily extended to the mixed strategy game in which Nash equilibrium always exists [14].) deviates from optimal social welfare. The cooperation between different interdependent networks can not be reached. The rationality of different entities that operates these networks makes the system inherently deficient.

Next we analyze our model for concrete interdependent networks. For coupled Random Regular (RR) networks, we set $q_i \in Z^+$ to be their average degree $\langle k\rangle_i$ ($i \in \{1,2\}$). Then we have $G_i(x,q_i) = x^{q_i}$ and $H_i = x^{q_i-1}$. For equations (10) and (11), g_i is shown in equation (6). We have $P_{\infty,1} = xg_1(x)$ and $P_{\infty,2} = yg_2(y)$. Let I_i and O_i be linear functions whose coefficients are 1 and 0.008 in equation (1) and the distributions of p_1 and p_2 be uniform distributions. Since the average degree of RR network only can be integer, the game over interdependent RR networks is discrete. By numerical validation, we have the matrix form and get the Nash equilibrium and social optimum of this discrete game. TABLE.I is the game matrix for the case where two networks are totally interdependent $r_{12} = r_{21} = 1$. From this matrix, we can calculate that $q_1 = q_2 = 9$ is the social optimum and $q_1 = q_2 = 7$ is the Nash equilibrium. Similarly, we can get the Nash equilibrium and social optimum for partially interdependent networks.

For two coupled ER networks, we set q_i to be their average degree $\langle k\rangle_i$ ($i \in \{1,2\}$). Then we have $G_i(x,q_i) = H_i(x,q_i) = exp[q_i(x-1)]$. Similarly to the first example, set I_i and O_i to be linear functions whose coefficients are 1 and 0.05 and the distribution of p_i be uniform distribution. As FIG.1 shows, we can solve Y_1 and Y_2 as functions of q_1 and q_2. By numerical simulation, we can obtain the Nash equilibrium and social optimum for this game. For instance, in the case of two totally coupled ER networks, we get that this game reaches its social optimum at $\langle k\rangle_1 = \langle k\rangle_2$=4.37 with Y=0.54 and reaches its Nash equilibrium at $\langle k\rangle_1 = \langle k\rangle_2$=3.09 with Y=0.49.



(a) (b)

FIG. 1. For two totally coupled ER networks whose strategy space are their average degrees $\{\langle k\rangle_1, \langle k\rangle_2\}$, let I and O be linear functions whose coefficients are 1 and 0.05. The payoff Y_1 and Y_2 are shown as functions of q_1 and q_2. By numerical simulations, we get that this game reaches its social optimum at $\langle k\rangle_1 = \langle k\rangle_2$=4.37 with Y=0.54 and reaches its Nash equilibrium at $\langle k\rangle_1 = \langle k\rangle_2$=3.09 with Y=0.49. We can see that there is a gap between Nash equilibrium and social optimum.



(a) (b) (c) (d)

FIG. 2. Let I and O be linear functions and the distribution of $p_i (i \in \{1,2\})$ be uniform distribution. For two coupled RR and ER network whose strategy spaces are average degree, $Y_1^{\max}+Y_2^{\max}$, $Y^{\max}$ and Δ are shown as functions of coupled strength r. Figure (a) and figure (b) are the $Y_{\max} - p$ and $(Y_1^{\max}+Y_2^{\max}) - p$ graphs for coupled RR networks and ER networks. Figure (c) and figure (d) are the $\Delta - p$ graphs for coupled RR networks and ER networks. We can see that reducing the coupled strength leads to an improvement of $Y^{\max}$, $Y_1^{\max}+Y_2^{\max}$ and Δ.

Suppose the payoff Y_i of network N_i is $Y_i = Y_i^{\max}$ at the Nash equilibrium and the optimal social welfare $Y = Y_{max}$. Define Δ as

$$\Delta = \frac{Y_1^{\max}+Y_2^{\max}}{Y^{\max}} \leq 1 \tag{17}$$

to evaluate this game. The higher Δ is, the closer the payoffs at at Nash equilibrium and social optimum are.

(Y_1,Y_2) \ q_2 / q_1	6	7	8	9	10
6	(0.366,0.366)	(0.376,0.368)	(0.383,0.367)	(0.388,0.364)	(0.392,0.360)
7	(0.368,0.376)	(0.379,0.379)	(0.386,0.378)	(0.391,0.375)	(0.395,0.371)
8	(0.367,0.383)	(0.378,0.386)	(0.385,0.385)	(0.390,0.382)	(0.394,0.378)
9	(0.364,0.388)	(0.375,0.391)	(0.382,0.390)	(0.387,0.387)	(0.391,0.383)
10	(0.360,0.392)	(0.395,0.371)	(0.378,0.394)	(0.383,0.391)	(0.386,0.386)

TABLE I. Game Matrix for two totally interdependent RR networks: the two components of the vectors in matrix are the payoffs of two entities with corresponding strategy profile. The Nash equilibrium and optimal social welfare are underlined in the matrix.



(a) (b)

FIG. 3. P_∞-p graph. Numerical simulation of two coupled ER networks at Nash equilibrium and social optimum. Figure(a) is the case of RR networks and figure(2) is the case of ER networks. The fraction of nodes in giant component P_∞ of network N_1 is shown as a function of p_1 for r=0.1 and r=0.6. We can see that the system is more vulnerable at Nash equilibrium than those at social optimum.

RR	star-like	chain-like	ER	star-like	chain-like
Δ	1.0	0.89	Δ	0.56	0.52

TABLE II. Δ is shown for interdependent RR networks and ER networks with different dependency topology. We can see that the Δ is higher for star-like system.

Set $r_{12} = r_{21} = r \leq 1$ in equations (10) and (11), we evaluate our model for interdependent networks with different coupled strength (i.e. with different r). As FIG.2 shows, we have that reducing the coupled strength of interdependent networks leads to an improvement of $Y^{\max}$, $Y_1^{\max} + Y_2^{\max}$ and Δ. It is worth mentioning that, since the game over interdependent RR networks is discrete, the Nash equilibrium, which only can be integer, does not change continuously about r and has discontinuity. Thus the $Y_1^{\max} + Y_2^{\max}$ and Δ are not strictly decreasing about r. However in general, the system is more profitable and efficient as a result of reducing coupled strength.

From the above examples of RR networks and ER networks, we can see that the rational behaviors will make the system not to reach the optimal robustness and become more vulnerable. As FIG.3 shows, we get the $P_\infty - p$ graph at Nash equilibrium and social optimum respectively for $r = 1$ and $r = 0.6$. The threshold is higher and P_∞ is lower at Nash equilibrium in the same scenario. Note that the system of interdependent networks is more vulnerable at Nash equilibrium as a result of rationality intuitively.



(a)Chain-like system (b)Star-like system

FIG. 4. Two types of systems composed of five coupled networks

It is important to find a way of reducing gap between optimal social welfare and Nash equilibrium for the game over interdependent networks. Besides reducing coupled strength, surprisingly, we find that the gap is narrower for the system with suitable dependency topology. We test our model for interdependent networks with different dependency topology. Let all coupled networks be totally interdependent. According to one-to-one correspondence [19], randomly removing $1 - p_i$ fractions of nodes from each network N_i are equivalent to a single attack on one of the networks which removes $1 - p = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{5} p_i$ fraction of nodes. Set the distribution of p to be uniform and I_i and O_i be linear functions with coefficients 1 and 0.035 in equations (1) for RR networks and 1 and 0.025 for ER networks. We validate the cases of chain-like and star-like system formed from five networks (See FIG.4). By numerical simulations, we gain that the star-like oligarch dependency topology tends to reduce the gap and improve the payoff (See TABLE.II).

Summarizing, in this paper we study the influence of rational behavior on the whole system. We reveal that, in the continuous game, the cooperation between different networks is reachable only when the average degree of each network is fixed in strategy space. While in general, there is a huge gap between the Nash equilibrium and optimal social welfare as a result of rationality which makes interdependent networks inherent deficient. We reveal and validate some factors (including weakening coupled strength of interdependent networks and designing suitable topology dependency of system) that help reduce the gap and improve the deficiency and overall payoff.

Interdependent networks exist in all aspects of our life, nature and technology. The game over interdependent networks is more complicated in real world since besides the fraction of giant component and average degree, the payoff may rely

on many factors and need further investigation. It is of great importance to find other efficient ways of reducing the gap between Nash equilibrium and optimal social welfare and improving the vulnerability and payoff.

This work is supported by NSFC project (No. 61528105). We thank Prof. Yang-Yu Liu at Harvard university for his valuable suggestion, Zidong Yang and Yongtao Zhang at Zhejiang university for their insightful discussions.

[1] Sergey V Buldyrev, Roni Parshani, Gerald Paul, H Eugene Stanley, and Shlomo Havlin. Catastrophic cascade of failures in interdependent networks. *Nature*, 464(7291):1025–1028, 2010.

[2] Jianxi Gao, Sergey V Buldyrev, H Eugene Stanley, and Shlomo Havlin. Networks formed from interdependent networks. *Nature physics*, 8(1):40–48, 2012.

[3] Christian M Schneider, Nuri Yazdani, Nuno AM Ara'ujo, Shlomo Havlin, and Hans J Herrmann. Towards designing robust coupled networks. *Scientific reports*, 3, 2013.

[4] Roni Parshani, Sergey V Buldyrev, and Shlomo Havlin. Interdependent networks: reducing the coupling strength leads to a change from a first to second order percolation transition. *Physical review letters*, 105(4):048701, 2010.

[5] Jia Shao, Sergey V Buldyrev, Shlomo Havlin, and H Eugene Stanley. Cascade of failures in coupled network systems with multiple support-dependence relations. *Physical Review E*, 83(3):036116, 2011.

[6] Jianxi Gao, Sergey V Buldyrev, Shlomo Havlin, and H Eugene Stanley. Robustness of a network of networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(19):195701, 2011.

[7] MA Di Muro, CE La Rocca, HE Stanley, S Havlin, and LA Braunstein. Recovery of interdependent networks. *Scientific reports*, 6, 2016.

[8] Frank Schweitzer, Giorgio Fagiolo, Didier Sornette, Fernando Vega-Redondo, Alessandro Vespignani, and Douglas R White. Economic networks: The new challenges. *science*, 325(5939):422–425, 2009.

[9] Vittorio Rosato, L Issacharoff, F Tiriticco, Sandro Meloni, S Porcellinis, and Roberto Setola. Modelling interdependent infrastructures using interacting dynamical models. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, 4(1-2):63–79, 2008.

[10] Steven M Rinaldi, James P Peerenboom, and Terrence K Kelly. Identifying, understanding, and analyzing critical infrastructure interdependencies. *IEEE Control Systems*, 21(6):11–25, 2001.

[11] Duncan S Callaway, Mark EJ Newman, Steven H Strogatz, and Duncan J Watts. Network robustness and fragility: Percolation on random graphs. *Physical review letters*, 85(25):5468, 2000.

[12] Vittorio Rosato, L Issacharoff, F Tiriticco, Sandro Meloni, S Porcellinis, and Roberto Setola. Modelling interdependent infrastructures using interacting dynamical models. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, 4(1-2):63–79, 2008.

[13] Béla Bollobás. Random graphs. In *Modern Graph Theory*, pages 215–252. Springer, 1998.

[14] Drew Fudenberg and Jean Tirole. *Game theory, 1991*, volume 393. 1991.

[15] Robert Gibbons. *A primer in game theory*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

[16] Jia Shao, Sergey V Buldyrev, Reuven Cohen, Maksim Kitsak, Shlomo Havlin, and H Eugene Stanley. Fractal boundaries of complex networks. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 84(4):48004, 2008.

[17] Mark EJ Newman. Spread of epidemic disease on networks. *Physical review E*, 66(1):016128, 2002.

[18] Charles D Brummitt, Raissa M DąŕSouza, and EA Leicht. Suppressing cascades of load in interdependent networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(12):E680–E689, 2012.

[19] Jianxi Gao, Sergey V Buldyrev, Shlomo Havlin, and H Eugene Stanley. Robustness of a network formed by n interdependent networks with a one-to-one correspondence of dependent nodes. *Physical Review E*, 85(6):066134, 2012.